

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-49 are pending in the Application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-49 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,717,879 to Moran et al. (hereinafter “Moran”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,294 to Ludwig et al. (hereinafter “Ludwig”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,765 to Adler et al. (hereinafter “Adler”).

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Moran, in view of Ludwig, and in further view of Adler. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran, in view of Ludwig, and further in view of Adler. The Examiner makes the allegation that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Moran with the teachings of Ludwig and Adler.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness in the Office Action. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicants submit that Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claimed limitations from each of the corresponding claims.

Claim 1

As amended, claim 1 recites a computer executable method for managing information during a meeting. As recited in claim 1, activities among participants are recorded during the meeting to produce recorded meeting data. As recited in claim 1, the recorded meeting data is analyzed absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while the meeting is ongoing. The cues are indicative of a participant directive representing an action on the information desired to be initiated during the meeting by a participant of the meeting. As further recited in claim 1, the action represented by the participant directive is performed in response to identifying the participant directive, thereby facilitating the management of information during the meeting.

Applicants respectfully submit that Moran, Ludwig, and Adler, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every one of the claimed limitations from claim 1. In particular, Applicants submit that the combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler fail to teach or suggest the feature of “analyzing recorded meeting data ...to identify one or more cues...indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information...” as recited in claim 1. Applicants further submit that even if Moran, Ludwig, and Adler were combined as suggested in the Office Action (although there appears to be no motivation in the references for the combination), the resultant combination would not teach or suggest the feature of “...performing said action represented by said participant directive...” as recited in claim 1.

Moran discloses a system for capture and playback of recording data representing collaborative activities, such as meetings, to recall conversations and/or other activities that occurred during the meeting. (Moran: Summary, lines 13-15, lines 33-35; Col. 4, lines 63-65). Events are used to create indices, which provide direct access to a point or span in time during the recorded collaboration activity. (Moran: Summary, lines 26-28). The events disclosed in Moran are data representing an occurrence, such as switching speakers, writing on a whiteboard, which happened at some point or interval during an activity being captured in the recording data. (Moran: Col. 6, lines 20-22). Playback of a session is performed by a session access device that utilizes the events to create a user interface for controlling session replay of contemporaneous time streams for the recall of conversations and/or other activities that occurred during the

meeting. The contemporaneous time stream playback in Moran is desirable to best convey the dynamics of the meeting. (Moran: Summary, lines 40-45).

Applicants submit that Moran has nothing to do with managing information during a meeting as recited in the method of claim 1. The replay of records of a meeting in Moran does not teach or suggest the feature of “analyzing recorded meeting data...while a meeting is ongoing” as recited in claim 1 where absent direct human intervention, recorded meeting data is analyzed to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing. Instead, Moran provides for the replay of records of meetings to recall conversations and/or activities that occurred during the meeting. (Moran: Col. 3, lines 33-35; Col. 4, lines 63-65). Moran is directed to the subsequent replay of meeting data to “best convey the dynamics of the meeting” by both those present and by those who did not attend. (Moran: Col. 3, lines 33-39). Furthermore, the events in the recorded meeting data of Moran are data representing occurrences, such as switching speakers, entering of notes, or the pushing of a button by a participant. Event data representing occurrences or actions by participants of a meeting in Moran do not teach or suggest cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during said meeting by a participant of the meeting as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s allegation that Moran teaches cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information as recited in claim 1. The Examiner points to Col. 22, lines 1-20 and FIG. 13 of Moran and alleges that this section teaches identifying a participant directive via accessing meeting data via button events initiated by participants during an ongoing meeting, the event indicators being color coded to identify a participant, with each button event indicative of a directive, as well as buttons and notes (i.e., a service - indicating a participant who feels something significant is being discussed).

Applicants submit that tracks 1119-1121 described in Col. 22, lines 1-7 of Moran represent audio data of a participant speaking. Moran discloses that the tracks 1119-1121 depicted in FIG. 11 indicate audio events. As discussed above, in Moran, an event is data representing an occurrence, such as switching speakers, writing on a whiteboard, which

happened at some point or interval during an activity being captured in the recording data. The audio data itself of Moran during which a participant is speaking does not teach or suggest the cues as recited in claim 1 indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting.

Applicants further submit that tracks 1119-1121 described in Col. 22, lines 8-11 of Moran represent text data. Moran discloses that tracks 1122-1123 indicate the start point of notes that were taken by a participant of the meeting. Moran discloses that the notes were taken on a personal computer or other text creation device. Moreover, FIG. 13, element 1302 of Moran depicts a note created by a meeting participant including text to remind a participant to use a point made by another participant during the recorded meeting with “the boss.” Applicants submit that the start point of the notes in Moran do not teach or suggest the cues as recited in claim 1 indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the actual text data itself does not teach or suggest the cues as recited in claim 1 indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that pressing a button when a participant “feels” that something significant described in Col. 22, lines 12-20 of Moran is merely visual indicator data stored in the records of a meeting. Moran discloses that track 1124 indicates instances of the event of “button” pressing. Moran discloses that these visual indicators are color coded to identify the person who depressed the button when the participant “feels” that something significant is being discussed. In response to these visual indicators during replay of the records of the meeting, a user in Moran can manually review other events in temporal proximity to the visual indicators, such as audio data or text data, that a participant felt was significant when pressing the button. Thus, Applicants submit that the visual indicator instances of the event of button pressing in Moran does not teach or suggest a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Moran does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing, the cues indicative of a participant

directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting by a participant of the meeting as recited in claim 1.

As Moran has nothing to do with managing information during a meeting and identifying one or more cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action on the information as recited in claim 1, Applicants further submit that Moran does not teach or suggest performing the action represented by the participant directive in response to identifying the participant directive as recited in claim 1. The Examiner is silent in the Office Action as to where Moran, or any of the other references, teach or suggest the feature of performing the action represented by an identified participant directive as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has fails to demonstrate a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In the Office Action, however, the Examiner makes the allegation that the event of “button” pressing, which is color coded to identify a participant in Col. 22, lines 12-20; FIG. 11; FIG. 13, and the note 1302 (also Col. 22, lines 8-12) which is associated with a speaker should be compared with claim 1 as quoted by the Examiner to read “in response to *identifying said participants...during said meeting.*” (Office Action dated Jan. 6, 2006: Page 3-Page 4). It appears that the Examiner has read the limitation of claim 1 that recites “in response to identifying said participant directive, performing said action represented by said participant directive” to be directed to identifying meeting participants during the meeting from visual indicators in meeting records described in Moran, where the Examiner points to the color coded visual indicators to identify a participant.

Applicants submit that Moran, and the other cited references, do not teach or suggest in response to identifying the participant directive, performing the action represented by the participant directive as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not identified any such teaching or suggestion in Moran, or any of the references. Applicants fail to see how identifying meeting participants from visual clues as noted by the Examiner teach or suggest performing an action as claim 1 clearly recites performing the action represented by the participant directive in response to identifying the participant directive.

Based on the above discussion of Moran, Applicants submit that Ludwig and Adler fail to cure the deficiencies of Moran. Because Moran is directed to offline review of

meeting records, the Examiner relies on Ludwig and Adler to cure the deficiencies of Moran. Applicants submit that the combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing, the cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting by a participant of the meeting as recited in claim 1. Applicants further submit that the combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler does not teach or suggest in response to identifying the participant directive, performing the action represented by the participant directive as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that Ludwig does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing, the cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting by a participant of the meeting as recited in claim 1. Ludwig discloses a multimedia collaboration system in which participants of a meeting can meet by real-time audio and video teleconferencing, and data conferencing, such as application sharing. (Ludwig: Col. 3, lines 1-10). Ludwig provides the benefit of face-to-face collaboration, and allows teleconferences to be recorded and stored for later playback, including both audio/video and all data interaction. (Ludwig: Col. 3, lines 57-60; Col. 3, lines 7-10).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Ludwig for displaying an interface of running meeting data for analysis. The Examiner makes the allegation that the combination of Ludwig with Moran provides Moran with the benefit of showing ongoing meeting data to participants as a meeting is ongoing, for analyzing purposes compared with claim 1 “*analyzing said recorded meeting data...by a participant of said meeting.*” Additionally, the Examiner makes the allegation that the combination of Moran and Ludwig allow a participant of the meeting to analyzing recorded meeting data while the meeting is ongoing. Thus, the Examiner relies on Ludwig’s real-time teleconferencing to cure Moran’s limitations of offline review of meeting records. The Examiner also relies on Ludwig to show analysis of ongoing meeting data by a participant of the meeting.

However, Applicants submit that nowhere does the Examiner demonstrate that Ludwig discloses cues indicative of a participant directive as recited in claim 1. While Ludwig does teach online data conferencing, Applicants submit that Ludwig does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing as recited in claim 1. Moreover, claim 1 is clearly directed to a computer executable method for managing information during a meeting. Analyzing meeting data by a participant of a meeting is not a limitation of claim 1. Claim 1 clearly recites analyzing the recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing. As recited in claim 1, the cues are indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting by a participant of said meeting. Thus, the ability of participants to view ongoing meeting data as suggested by the Examiner is substantially different from analyzing the recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing as recited in claim 1.

Thus, the Examiner has not pointed to where Ludwig cures the deficiencies of Moran, but merely relies on Ludwig for displaying of ongoing meeting data to participants. As discussed above, Moran does not teach or suggest at least the cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Applicants submit that Ludwig does not teach or suggest the cues as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that the combination of Ludwig and Moran does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing as recited in claim 1.

Applicants further submit that there is no motivation to combine Ludwig and Moran as suggested by the Examiner. Moran is clearly directed to offline review of meeting records. (Moran: Col. 3, lines 33-35 playback is desirable to recall conversations). Moran creates a user interface based on event information for controlling replay of recorded meetings. Playback of event information best conveys the dynamics of the meeting. (Moran Col. 3, lines 38-39). On the other hand, Ludwig is directed to providing ongoing audio/video and data

teleconferencing in real-time that approximate a face-to-face collaboration. Ludwig also discloses that the meetings may be recorded. (Ludwig: Summary; Col. 3, lines 8-10). One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the events information of Moran with the real-time presentation of data in Ludwig. The real-time review of event data in Ludwig would not best convey the dynamics of the meeting as provided during playback of the meeting records as suggested by Moran. Therefore, Applicants submit that there is no motivation to combine Moran and Ludwig.

Finally, Applicants submit that Adler fails to cure the deficiencies of both Moran and Ludwig. Applicants submit that Adler does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing, the cues indicative of a participant directive representing an action on information desired to be initiated during the meeting by a participant of the meeting as recited in claim 1. Adler discloses a system for extracting key information from digitized audio messages. Information, such as a telephone number and name of the caller, is derived from a voice message and used to establish links to the information within the message. (Adler: Abstract).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Adler to teach an automatic method of extracting pertinent data from an audio message. The Examiner makes the allegation that the combination of Adler with Moran provides Moran with the benefit of automatic event indicators without distracting the meeting participants. The Examiner cited the Adler references in response to Applicant's previous amendment of "absent direct human intervention" in various claims. Thus, the Examiner relies on Adler's automatic information extraction to cure Moran's limitations of offline review of meeting records by a person. The information extracted in Adler represents names and telephone numbers, which are substantially different from cues indicative of participant directions representing actions on information as recited in claim 1. Thus, while Adler does teach extraction of information from voice recordings, Applicants submit that Adler does not teach or suggest analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues contained in the recorded meeting data while a meeting is ongoing as recited in claim 1.

In light of the above, Applicants submit that the combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler do not teach or suggest the feature of performing the action as recited in claim 1. Moran does not teach or suggest in response to identifying the participant directive, performing the action represented by the participant directive thereby facilitating the management of information during the meeting. The Examiner relies on Ludwig for showing ongoing meeting data to participants of a meeting for analysis by a participant. While Ludwig does teach showing meeting data to participants while the meeting is ongoing, Ludwig fails to teach or suggest analyzing the data to identify cues indicative of participant directives and performing actions represented by the participant directive as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner relies on Alder to merely to disclose analyzing recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention. While Adler does teach a system of extracting information from voice recordings, Adler does not teach or suggest that the extracted information represents the cues indicative of participant directives and performing actions represented by the participant directives as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the combination of Moran, Ludwig, and Adler fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over Moran, Ludwig, and Adler.

Claims 2-49

Applicants submit that independent claims 10, 23, 33, and 42 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-9, 11-22, 24-32, 34-41, and 43-49 that depend from independent claims 1, 10, 23, 33, and 42 respectively are allowable because they dependent from allowable independent claims. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are allowable for additional reasons as the dependent claims recite limitations not found in the independent claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/

Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 650-326-2422  
SFP:am  
60693416 v2